Before the **Federal Communications Commission** Washington, DC 20554

In the Matter of

Continental Airlines, Inc.

Petition for Declaratory Ruling Regarding Whether Certain Restrictions on Antenna Installation Are Permissible Under the Commission's Over-the-Air Reception Devices (OTARD) Rules ET Docket No. 05-247

REPLY OF CONTINENTAL AIRLINES, INC. TO THE MASSACHUSETTS PORT AUTHORITY MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

Continental Airlines, Inc. ("Continental"), through its undersigned counsel, respectfully responds to the Motion for Extension of Time ("Motion")¹ filed by the Massachusetts Port Authority ("Massport") in the above-captioned matter.²

While Continental does not object to a brief extension of time, it does object to Massport's characterization of the dispute that Continental has placed before the Commission. Massport's Motion attempts to paint this matter as merely a disagreement between private parties that perhaps can be resolved by means of private dispute resolution and, therefore, one in which

¹ Massachusetts Port Authority, Motion for Extension of Time, ET Docket No. 05-247, filed August 16, 2005 (*Massport Motion*).

² See OET Seeks Comment on Petition from Continental Airlines for Declaratory Ruling Regarding Whether Certain Restrictions on Antenna Installation are Permissible under the Commission's Over-the-Air Reception Devices (OTARD) Rules, ET Docket No. 05-247, Public Notice, DA 05-2213, 2005 FCC Lexis 4373 (rel. July 29, 2005).

the Commission need not be involved.³ Continental disputes that characterization and asserts that this matter raises significant public policy issues for the flying public and all airport tenants with regard to the Commission's Over-the-Air Reception Devices ("OTARD") rules and its recently issued Policy Statement regarding preservation and promotion of the interconnected nature of public Internet. Likewise, Continental's ability and flexibility to craft wireless solutions for its own internal operations and for its customers at Boston-Logan International Airport ("Logan") and elsewhere are at issue. Much more is at stake in this matter than the interpretation of restrictions in a lease agreement and it is strongly in the public interest that the Commission resolve the public policy issues presented and resolve them promptly. Massport believes airport tenants, including but not exclusively airlines, are required to use its Wi-Fi system notwithstanding the OTARD rules and are not allowed to operate their own systems. Massport has even questioned the legality of the OTARD rules. Continental believes it has the right to operate its own Wi-Fi system at Logan and seeks by its petition to the Commission to vindicate its rights under the OTARD rules. Clearly, the Commission will substantially benefit the public, not only Continental and Massport, by resolving the public policy issues presented and Massport's interpretation of the OTARD rules.

Continental would like to further clarify the record by stating that it is not in discussions with Massport with a view towards settling any dispute it has with Massport on this matter nor has it requested that Massport "explore options for meeting Continental's commercial interests." 4 Any discussions Continental has had with Massport have been in an attempt to understand what public safety issues Massport alleges have arisen as a result of the use of Continental's Wi-Fi system at Logan and to assess Massport's allegations of interference with other Wi-Fi systems.

³ Massport Motion, p. 2.

⁴ *Id*.

Continental has been listening to Massport, not engaging in settlement discussions. Continental

continues to believe Massport's allegations are without any basis in fact and, if there were

interference, technical solutions are available (and are widely used at airports and elsewhere) to

remedy such interference without attempting to deprive Continental of its rights under the

OTARD rules to operate its own Wi-Fi system.

In Continental's view, there is no need for an extension of time and the public interest is

best served by speedy resolution of Massport's claim that the OTARD rules do not apply and do

not allow Continental to operate its Wi-Fi system at Logan. Nevertheless, if the Commission is

inclined to grant an extension, Continental does not object to a brief one.

Respectfully submitted,

CONTINENTAL AIRLINES, INC.

Donna J. Katos

Managing Attorney-Litigation Thomas Newton Bolling Senior Attorney – Regulatory CONTINENTAL AIRLINES, INC.

1600 Smith Street – HQSLG

Houston, TX 77002

/s/ Henry M. Rivera

By Henry M. Rivera

Edgar Class

VINSON & ELKINS LLP

The Willard Office Building

1455 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 600

Washington, DC 20004-1008

Telephone: (202) 639-6770

Its Attorneys

Dated: August 18, 2005

3

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Edgar Class, do hereby certify that on this 18th day of August 2005, a copy of the foregoing "Reply of Continental Airlines, Inc. to the Massachusetts Port Authority Motion for Extension of Time" was sent via first-class mail, postage paid, except as otherwise noted, to the following:

Marlene H. Dortch (Via ECFS) Office of the Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW Washington, DC 20554

James D. Schlichting (Via E-mail)
Deputy Chief
Office of Engineering and Technology
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Bruce A. Romano (Via E-mail) Associate Chief (Legal) Office of Engineering and Technology Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW Washington, DC 20554

Lauren Van Wazer (Via E-mail) Special Counsel to the Office Chief Office of Engineering and Technology Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW Washington, DC 20554

Gary Thayer (Via E-mail) Office of Engineering and Technology Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW Washington, DC 20554

Holden E. Shannon Senior Vice President Global Real Estate & Security Continental Airlines, Inc. 1600 Smith Street HQSVP Houston, TX 77002 Robert Edwards
Staff Vice President, System Operations
Continental Airlines, Inc.
1600 Smith Street HQSTK
Houston, TX 77002

Christine M. Gill (Via E-mail)
Keith A. McCrickard
McDermott Will & Emery LLP
600 13th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Counsel for Massachusetts Port Authority

Deborah Lau Kee Associate Deputy Chief Legal Counsel Massachusetts Port Authority One Harborside Drive, Suite 200S East Boston, MA 02128-2800

Patricia A. Hahn General Counsel and Senior Vice President Airports Council International-North America 1775 K Street, NW, Suite 500 Washington, DC 20006

Matthew C. Ames Miller & Van Eaton, P.L.L.C. Suite 1000 1155 Connecticut Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20036 Counsel for Airports Council International-North America

/s/ Edgar Class	
Edgar Class	